

E431

.M46



E431  
M46

SPEECH

OF

HON. S. MAYALL, OF MAINE,

ON THE

FINANCIAL AND TERRITORIAL POLICY OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 2, 1855.



WASHINGTON:  
PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.  
1855.

E431

.M46

## S P E E C H .

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. MAYALL said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to make a few remarks, first, in relation to the financial policy of the Administration, and secondly in regard to its territorial policy.

Before entering upon a general discussion of the financial policy of the Administration, I will read that portion of the President's message relating to the treaty which was made between the North American British Provinces upon the one part, and the United States of America upon the other, during the last session of Congress:

"Since the adjournment of Congress, the ratifications of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, relative to coast fisheries, and to reciprocal trade with the British North American provinces, have been exchanged, and some of its anticipated advantages are already enjoyed by us, although its full execution was to abide certain acts of legislation not yet fully performed. So soon as it was ratified, Great Britain opened to our commerce the free navigation of the river St. Lawrence, and to our fishermen unmolessted access to the shores and bays, from which they had been previously excluded, on the coasts of her North American provinces; in return for which, she asked for the introduction, free of duty, into the ports of the United States, of the fish caught on the same coast by British fishermen. This being the compensation, stipulated in the treaty, for privileges of the highest importance and value to the United States, which were thus voluntarily yielded before it became effective, the request seemed to me to be a reasonable one; but it could not be acceded to, from want of authority to suspend our laws imposing duties upon all foreign fish.

"In the mean time, the Treasury Department issued a regulation, for ascertaining the duties paid or secured by bonds on fish caught on the coasts of the British provinces, and brought to our markets by British subjects, after the fishing grounds had been made fully accessible to the citizens of the United States. I recommend to your favorable consideration a proposition, which will be submitted to you, for authority to refund the duties and cancel the bonds thus received. The provinces of Canada and New Brunswick have also anticipated the full operation of the treaty, by legislative arrangements, respectively, to admit, free of duty, the products of the United States mentioned in the free list of the treaty; and an arrangement, similar to that regarding British fish, has been made for duties now chargeable on the products of those provinces enumerated in the same free list, and introduced therefrom into the United States; a proposition for refunding which will, in my judgment, be in like manner entitled to your favorable consideration."

Although my views do not comport with the views expressed by the President in relation to the

reciprocity treaty, I would not have any one infer, therefore, that I am opposed to free trade between the North American British Provinces, on the one hand, and the United States on the other. I have been long of the opinion that a free, mutual, and independent reciprocation of the agricultural productions and manufactured articles in both countries would result alike advantageously to the interests of both. Upon an examination of the articles imported in 1851 and 1852, named in the schedule of the treaty, I find the balance of trade in these articles is more than five hundred per centum against us. Hence I am decidedly of the opinion that the treaty, as it now stands, in its practical effect and operation, has resulted advantageously to the interests of the British Provinces, and, upon the other hand, to the destruction of American interests.

In order to explain my meaning in relation to this point, I will suppose, for instance, that the United States propose and enter into a treaty with Great Britain, in certain specific articles raised here in our own country, and that we are to have reciprocity of trade with Great Britain in cotton, rice, tobacco, corn, flour, beef, pork, butter, cheese—a system which would, in fact, include all the agricultural productions of the United States which are articles of exportation. Take it for granted that Great Britain enters into a treaty with the Government of the United States in relation to these articles. Here would be a treaty resulting directly for the interests of the United States, and against those of Great Britain. The treaty between the Provinces and the United States produces precisely the same effects in relation to the interests of this country. I propose to avoid the evils resulting from such a treaty, to a great extent. I have prepared a bill, providing for full and legitimate free trade between the Canadas and the States.

The bill which I intend to introduce provides, that whenever the Government of Great Britain shall agree with that of the United States to admit certain articles of American produce or manufacture therein enumerated, duty free, into the British Provinces, the same articles produced or manufactured by the British Provinces shall be admitted into this country also duty free. The articles enumerated consist of manufactures from



grass, straw, whalebone, hair, hemp, iron, and all other metals, cotton, flax, silk, wool, leather, marble, paper, papier maché, wood, &c., also prepared meats, vegetables, animal oils, paints, glass, &c.; so that there will be an equal encouragement given to the manufactures of this country as to the farming interests of the Provinces—making it to the interest of those Provinces to take our manufactures in return for their agricultural productions, and thus making the commercial intercourse truly reciprocal, and not merely nominally so.

If the provisions of this bill are much longer resisted by statute, they will triumph in spite of statute. The relative position of the two countries—their business connections—necessarily compel the practice of free trade. The steam car, swifter than the fabled messenger of ancient commerce, is gradually and steadily accomplishing this great desideratum. Already lines of railway penetrate the heart of the Provinces, from Maine, Massachusetts, and New York, and still other lines are in progress or contemplation, which, when completed, will have a direct tendency, and, in fact, will superinduce reciprocity, in spite of all the artificial barriers that unwise legislation can pile up to thwart its peaceful and beneficent progress. The provisions of this bill will then be carried into practical effect. The effect of unrestricted commerce between this country and these Provinces, will be immeasurably to increase the business and enhance the profits of the railway lines in question, a result which will redound more largely to the benefit of our own citizens than to that of our neighbors, because, in the first place, our pecuniary interest in those lines is greater, and because, also, the established and unalterable current of trade must make the Provinces tributary to us, rather than ourselves tributary to them.

No State in the Union is so vitally interested in the question of free trade as Maine. She is equally interested with several other States, on account of the railway connections with the Provinces. She is also more deeply interested from another consideration, being a border State of the Union. With the barriers of commercial restriction kept up between her and the Provinces, her position is isolated, and, like all border States, less favorable to commerce than those States more centrally situated. The establishment of commercial reciprocity, either by treaty or statute, between the United States and the British Provinces, will change the face of affairs, and give to Maine a more central position in the world of commerce, augmenting her influence and her power, and thereby securing a larger share of the trade of the world than she can now possibly command. When the great system of railways is completed, which is to strike out a new and shorter path from the commercial metropolis of the United States to that of Great Britain, running through the whole extent of her frontier, Maine will become an essential and eminently central portion of this vast international highway of commerce, and will, consequently, derive all the advantages that her new position will confer upon her, which must be incalculably great and valuable.

The idea that reciprocity will affect unfavorably the shipping and building interests of this country, and especially of Maine, is, in my opinion, founded in error—in a total misapprehension of the effect of reciprocity on one of those branches of industry in which Maine is more largely interested than any other State in the Union. Such

an apprehension, I repeat, is grounded in false notions of political economy, and of the effects of commercial freedom. They are precisely the fears expressed by the protectionists of the North, in respect to the effect of reciprocal free trade in navigation between the United States and Great Britain. It was said that that great step towards commercial emancipation would be the ruin of our foreign trade, and drive our ships from the ocean in a very short period. Yet, instead of witnessing the predicted calamity, we behold our commerce expanding, our sails whitening every sea, and every part of the earth is made to contribute to the convenience and luxury of this highly favored nation; our ships engaging in trade in which they never before shared, and successfully competing with those of Great Britain in markets from which they were before wholly excluded.

Then, I say, in view of the successful effects of this system in the history of the past, where is the individual who is so completely destitute of every principle of patriotic pride as not to rejoice at the strides of our commercial freedom, and to welcome the approaching proximity of that glorious maxim of "Free trade and sailors' rights?" Nobody would now consent to return to the old restrictive system in navigation; the same will be found to be the case with free trade with the Provinces. Instead of crippling our commerce, and injuring ship-building, it will enlarge the circle of the one, and stimulate the energies of the other. In this day, when new, and almost illimitable fields of commerce are being opened to the enterprising and adventurous, giving employment to more shipping than the industry of all now engaged in that work can supply, it is idle, it is preposterous to talk of ship-building in, or the freighting business of, Maine being ruined, or even injured, in the slightest degree, by all the additions which the concentrated labor of all the Provinces employed in ship-building can make to the common stock of the world.

And how much better is the objection based on the hypothesis that reciprocity is to injure the lumbering business in which Maine is so deeply interested? Not a whit; not a whit. It is an erroneous idea which some have entertained, that facilities for transportation of the productions of the interior to the sea-coast, or that any evils extended to any branch of business whereby competition is created, will injuriously affect the price of those productions, or that branch of business thus brought into competition. The experience of all practical business men proves the fallacy of this opinion. All the competition which reciprocal trade with the Provinces will create in the lumbering or the ship-building business of Maine, will but tend to the benefit and profit of those branches of trade. There is no danger that an ample market will not be found for all the lumber which Maine and the Provinces can produce. The danger is rather that both together cannot much longer supply the rapidly increasing demand. The change which reciprocity would lead to in this particular, as respects Maine, would be but slight. Already the lumber regions of the State have been reduced to the St. John and its tributaries. The amount remaining on the Saco, the Androscoggin, and the Kennebec, is scarcely sufficient to supply the rapidly increasing demand for home consumption. The same remark is fast becoming true of the Penobscot; at any rate, there is little danger that a ready market and adequate prices cannot be found for all the lumber that can be manufactured on its waters.

The lumber regions of Maine at this time—all,

at any rate, that need protection—are, therefore, on the St. John and its tributaries. What was the condition of the lumbering interest there before the reciprocity treaty? Worse, infinitely worse, than it can possibly be with reciprocity. The St. John is the only outlet. This river, or the mouth of it, is within foreign jurisdiction. Our lumber has to pass out of this river. In its transit it was subject to all manner of delays and pecuniary exactions, so that lumber on the Maine side of the St. John was not regarded as worth more than one half as much as the same amount on the Penobscot. Let reciprocity of trade be established, under which we shall acquire the privilege of carrying our manufactured articles into the Provinces, and the advantages resulting to the United States will be incalculably great and valuable. It will furnish the manufacturers with a new and additional market for almost every article manufactured in the United States, and thereby give an impetus to that branch of industry in which the New England States are so deeply interested. Under this Elgin treaty we are deprived of equality in trade. The Provinces can bring all their productions to us, and we cannot carry anything in return to pay for them, which their trade demands, without paying duty thereon.

The very able report made by Mr. Andrews on colonial and lake trade, in 1852, furnishes an abundance of evidence to prove this fact. From this report I quote the following list of exports from Canada to the United States, giving the principal articles and values, for the year 1851:

Ashes.....	\$65,992
Lumber.....	766,623
Shingles.....	20,732
Cattle of all kinds and sizes.....	140,176
Horses.....	153,843
Wool.....	41,896
Wheat.....	491,760
Flour.....	1,181,484
Barley and rye.....	75,596
Beans and peas.....	41,588
Oats.....	135,708
Butter.....	38,001
Eggs.....	38,003
Unenumerated.....	1,703,664
Total.....	\$4,929,084

As can be seen by referring to table No. 9, in Canadian returns, the dutiable and free goods are thus stated for the year 1851:

Dutiable imports into Canada from the United States.....	\$7,971,380
Free imports into Canada from the United States.....	1,147,368
Total.....	\$9,118,748

Total quantity imported into the United States from Canada, for the year ending June 30, 1852:

Wheat, (bushels).....	870,889.....	value, \$609,681
Flour, (cwt.).....	490,301.....	" 1,003,923
Rye, oats, &c., &c.....	".....	" 203,570
Total.....		\$1,802,179

The above table proves conclusively that all the articles which the Provinces export come in free of duty; for all the articles are named in the schedule of the treaty, viz: "Grain, flour, and breadstuffs of all kinds; animals of all kinds; fresh, smoked, and salt meats; fish of all kinds; hides, furs, and skins; pelts, wool, coal, firewood; fish oil, butter, cheese, tallow, unmanufactured tobacco," &c., &c. I would prefer the Elgin treaty to none for the State of Maine, because Maine has to buy largely, for her own consumption, such articles as are exported from

the Provinces. But I think I have proved conclusively that it operates against the interest of the United States, as a whole; therefore, I have called the attention of the House to the subject, and prepared a bill, the provisions of which, if carried out, will result more advantageously to the interests of both countries, and place the United States on an equal footing with the Provinces.

The next movement to which I desire to call attention is, the repeal of the Missouri prohibition of slavery from Kansas and Nebraska. It was a compact rendered sacred by the circumstances under which it was entered into, by time, and by the faithful observance of all statesmen of the past and the present generation, up to the commencement of the present Congress.

At the last session of the previous Congress, a bill was reported to this House by the Committee on Territories, for organizing a government there. It made no allusion to the Missouri compromise, leaving it in full force. The question was publicly asked of the committee, or a member of it, why the Wilmot proviso was not embodied in the bill? The answer was then made to the House, and the country, that slavery had been excluded by the Missouri compromise, and that no repetition of such exclusion would render it more valid. Sir, no Democrat, no Whig then dreamed that this exclusion of slavery was unjust or unconstitutional. No man, at that time, dreamed that "popular sovereignty," of which we have heard so much, consisted in the privilege of holding a certain laboring portion of the population of this country in bondage—in the power to buy and sell persons who happened to be unable to defend themselves from such treatment. The bill passed this body without opposition or objection on this point; and when it came up in the Senate, the Vice President declared his hostility to the bill on account of the territory to which it applied being free by reason of this Missouri prohibition, but declared, that so far as that objection was concerned, the bill might as well pass then as at any future day, for that prohibition of slavery could never be repealed. The Senate heard these remarks, and assented to their correctness, so far as "silence gives consent;" for not a member expressed the least doubt of their perfect accuracy. Those grave and reverend Senators, who have since reasoned so profoundly upon "popular sovereignty," had not then discovered that it consisted in the privilege of owning the bodies of their fellow creatures, born on the same soil; children, perhaps, of the same father; and nursed, it might be, by the same hands; but now, the right to buy and sell human flesh is called "*popular sovereignty*."

But, sir, it would appear that the Administration were not remiss in looking into the question of popular sovereignty. The bill repealing the prohibition of slavery, was brought forward by the friends of the Administration. It was urged upon the Senate and the House by the leaders of the President's party. (I will not call them "Democrats.") The President's organ in this city, was constant and unceasing in its exhortations to pass that bill, promising, that if once passed, it would quiet all agitation, and give peace to the country. The people of the free States became alarmed; sent in their petitions; called on their Representatives to oppose the repudiation of this time-honored compromise—rendered sacred by its associations with the best men and greatest statesmen, and patriots of our nation. But the popular mind



of the North was regarded with contempt; the will of the people was spurned by the Administration, and these sincere advocates of "popular sovereignty," and the repeal of the Missouri compromise was insisted on. Here, in this Hall, we were told that the President desired the passage of that measure, and Representatives were threatened with political excommunication if they did not aid the Administration in carrying out this policy. The object was attained; the bill passed; slavery was admitted into Kansas and Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, had the repeal of the Missouri compromise been fairly placed before the people, the result would have been widely different. It was smuggled through Congress in a most unjustifiable manner. Had it been known that Mr. Pierce was in favor of the repeal, he would not now have been an occupant of the White House. He had my cordial support, and I exulted with thousands of others in his triumphant election; but the passage of that bill has scattered the party that sustained him to the four winds. His opposers grasped this new issue with avidity, and they will follow it up to the last extremity. The excitement on the slavery question had begun to subside. The East, the West, the North, and the South, were at peace on that subject. None desired to revive an agitation so detrimental to commerce, and to the peaceful pursuits of industry. The President's promises in his inaugural had given hope that this quiet would be preserved throughout the continuance of his administration in power. The hatred of slavery, naturally strong in the northern mind, was in repose when this firebrand was thrown into combustibles that would otherwise have remained inert, and it has kindled a fire that cannot now be extinguished. And this was done by the immediate friends, and with not only the marked approval, but also with the strenuous efforts of the present Administration.

There was no immediate call for the establishment of a territorial government in Kansas and Nebraska. Events have shown since, that the object of the abettors of that bill was to avail themselves of the then condition of Congress, that they might pass through the repeal for the purpose of introducing slavery into that immense territory. A more impolitic course could not have been pursued, even by the South. In all probability there never will be another slave State admitted into this Union. If a compromise that had stood for a third of a century, that had become sacred by age, that the people looked upon as permanent, could be so easily set aside, is it reasonable to suppose that there will ever be another? Such faithless, unprincipled combinations are not to be trusted.

Why do the people of the South wish to extend their "peculiar institution" into free territory? They, themselves, are not so disingenuous as to deny that it is an evil—and a great evil—and yet they not only refuse to rid themselves of it, but show an intemperate zeal to extend the evil to others. The institution of slavery, they say, is handed down from their ancestors. They find themselves entangled with it, and cannot safely extricate themselves from it at once. The gentleman says his finer sensibility does not reproach him, as it is an evil that did not originate in himself; that he does not *sin per se*, (of himself), though he holds human beings in bondage. Well for them that they have something to console them, and ease the upbraids of their consciences! Let us suppose the gentleman to possess a hereditary

contagious disease. This may be said to be a misfortune, but no crime. But, supposing he is zealous and active in communicating this distemper to others, can it then be said that he does not *sin per se*?

The immortal Washington and Jefferson did not desire the extension of slavery. The framers of our Constitution were aware that the institution was incompatible with the declaration of rights. I am sorry to say there is a change for the worse since their day. Many who pretend to be the admirers of those illustrious characters, are now striving not only to have the baneful institution established in *perpetuo*, but to extend it as far as possible. God deliver us from such spurious Democracy! These men threaten to dissolve the Union if they are prevented from carrying out their base designs. Our Executive possesses almost unlimited power to arrest their effecting so nefarious a purpose. They dare not, they cannot do it. Look at the inevitable consequences of their forming a separate Confederacy. Such an event would not only be the means of liberating their slaves, but the very lives of the leaders of so foolish a project would be sacrificed. The Union will, at all hazards, be preserved. Greece might have given laws to the whole eastern world, but she wasted her energies in civil strife. The monarchs of the Old World are expecting us to accomplish what they cannot effect. They will be disappointed in their hopes. An attempt to separate this Union will be crushed in the bud. I have no fears on that ground. Northern statesmen have too long succumbed to the unreasonable demands of southern politicians. The time has arrived to stop them in their encroachments.

Look at the fugitive slave law—a law that cannot be enforced, except by resorting to the most desperate means. I cannot go into the merits, or rather the demerits, of this law. The fourth article, third section, of the Constitution, gives no countenance to this arbitrary law. The great city of Boston came nigh being deluged in blood in the case of the rendition of Burns. Let the slave States adopt some means of keeping their slaves, or liberate them. It certainly is not reasonable to make slave catchers of the people of the East and West; and to repeal the fugitive slave act will be the work of the next Congress.

Sir, the complaint which I make of the Administration is this: that it should pursue a line of policy, and recommend measures to Congress, which every one must know are perfectly obnoxious and contrary to the sentiments of the people, and then call upon the Democratic party in Congress to pass them through without a consultation. If the repeal of the Missouri compromise was to be forced through the House as a party measure, the Democratic members of Congress who were to take the responsibility between the Administration and the people, should have been called together in caucus, and the subject fully and fairly discussed; and every Democratic member, however humble, was entitled to have a hearing in relation to a measure on which would turn his political success or defeat. We all knew it was the members of this House "on whom the tower in Siloam" was to fall. Hence we were the most vitally interested. If the Administration was determined to destroy itself, it had no right to make a slaughter-house of the whole Democratic party. There were some members on this floor who did not desire to be beheaded by the effect of unwise and impolitic measures, forced



upon us by the Administration against our own consent. The effect has been, and will be, that two thirds of the Democratic members on this floor are prostrated, politically, and, perhaps, forever. Who is responsible for the defeat of so many Democratic members, and the destruction of the Democratic party? No earthly power but the Administration; and no man can deny it.

My friend near me says I fought against the repeal severely, and he would like to know why I was not again returned. No matter for that, Mr. Chairman. It was "death in the pot" to a Democrat, whether he voted for or against that repeal. It is true, I fought against the repeal of the Missouri compromise, assiduously, night and day. I spoke against it; I voted against it. I afterwards voted to suspend the rules to enable the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] to introduce his bill for the repeal of the fugitive slave law. I also voted to abolish the rations of spiritous liquors in the Navy. In all three of these positions which I took, and votes which I gave, I am confident I am sustained by the approval of my constituents. The leading men of the Democratic party proper, treated me very handsomely, and were willing to place my name before the people, but I did not desire a nomination. I thought that "discretion was the better part of valor," and that I would stand aloof from the present fused and confused state of political affairs.

It is true, we all feel the force of the remarks made daily upon this floor, "that the Nebraska and Kansas question was no test in our congressional elections. If it had been, all the anti-Nebraska members would have been returned." My only reply to this is, my position is sustained if I am not returned.

It is too apt to be the case, and is an evil which ought to be corrected, that the people of the North do not stand by those Representatives and Senators who firmly stand by them. If the people would have their sentiments carried out in Congress, they should sustain the men who have the firmness and fixedness of purpose to carry them out. Let me say on this floor, it matters not to me if I am never returned to this Hall again, or if I never hold another political office in my life; I will act in conformity to my own honest conviction of right and duty on all questions, independent of consequences and "the opinion of all mankind." If I am charged with having deserted the ranks of the Democratic party, I reply I have stood firm to the principles of Democracy as I have always understood them; and if the leaders of the Democratic party and the Administration have proved themselves recreant to those principles, as I am certain they have, I throw back the charge of desertion, and declare that it is they who have been unfaithful to the trust reposed in them by a confiding people; unfaithful to the principles on which they were elected; unfaithful to the great principles of human rights, on which all true Democracy is founded; unfaithful to the promises made on their coming into office, and, as I have remained true in all these particulars, there is, necessarily, a separation for which they alone are responsible.

Mr. Chairman, having answered the gentleman, I trust to his satisfaction, I will now return to my point. There never was an Administration that came into office under more favorable circumstances than the present. It does seem to me that it was the part of wisdom for the Adminis-

tration to have pursued a line of policy consistent with its professed principles, reflecting, in their system of legislation, the will of the great American people, which would have rendered it one of the most popular Administrations since the organization of the Government. Then the Democratic members on this floor would have been returned to the Thirty-Fourth Congress, and the Democratic party would have been the great absorbing party of the Union.

Had the southern delegation on this floor followed the judicious advice and noble example of some of its most distinguished members—the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. BENTON]; the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. HUNT]; the gentlemen from Tennessee, [Messrs. CULLOM and ETHERIDGE]; and the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. MILLSON]—by whose wise and patriotic course they have stamped their characters upon the age in which they live, and have erected enduring monuments in the hearts of the American people, they would have taken a bold stand against this unwise policy of the Administration, and they would have maintained the Missouri compromise as a compact with the North. Had they done this, they would have perpetuated the confidence in the honor and integrity of the South which then existed; the repeal of the fugitive slave act would not have been contemplated; and all parts of this Union would have been cemented together as becometh one people—one nation. But they did not do this. It is now too late! The mere reënactment of the Missouri compromise will not appease the righteous indignation of the northern people. They have lost all faith in compromises with slavery and slaveholders, and nothing short of repealing the fugitive slave act; the removal of slavery from the District of Columbia; the entire dissolution of the Federal Government from all connection with slavery;—will restore that unanimity of feeling which existed in this country previous to the repeal of the Missouri compromise.

Every effort was made to avoid the responsibility of thus opening these Territories to slavery. The people were told that slavery would not be carried there if the prohibition were repealed. After the deed was done, during the late canvass in various northern States, the friends of the Administration endeavored to carry out their pretensions in favor of liberty by insisting that there would be no slavery there. This appears to have been a suitable finale of the deception. Even while these pretensions were being put forth, we saw, published in the newspapers, the prices of certain laborers, mechanics, and other inhabitants of these newly organized Territories. By the aid of the Administration, the slave-dealers were then trafficking in a defenseless part of the population. The excitement on the slave question has increased and swallowed up all others. It now wholly absorbs the popular mind. In these attempts to silence agitation, the President has shown himself wholly incompetent to judge of the popular feeling, and the people no longer confide in his ability to conduct the Government.

Now, sir, the North has taken its position. You have repealed the Missouri compromise. It was the basis of all legislative compromises. With it, all others fall; and so far as the free States are concerned, they are under no obligation whatever to retain any act of Congress passed for the benefit of slavery. Indeed, every moral obligation now rests upon them to repeal immediately so much of the statute of 1807 as authorizes the coast-

wise slave trade. As the South have refused to permit freedom to exist in Kansas and Nebraska, will they insist, or have they the effrontery to ask, northern men to protect their traffic in our common humanity? "Non-intervention," was the cry of the Administration and the South last year; and shall not the next Congress reiterate the watchword when asked to withdraw the protection of our flag to that revolting trade? Will any one contend that we are bound to protect this traffic on the high seas, and discard all protection to freedom in our Territories? No, sir. The cry of "popular sovereignty" will be repeated in the next Congress, when the proposition to repeal the statute authorizing the coastwise slave trade shall come up for consideration. Let the people who are shipped on board our vessels for the slave markets of the South, shape their own domestic institutions. Congress ought not to interfere. Let them cast the slave-traders into the briny deep; Congress will not legislate slavery on board American vessels. Will not the North hold the chalice of "non-intervention" and "popular sovereignty" to southern lips? I am aware that the withdrawal of our protection from this unhallowed commerce will seriously affect the vital interests of the slave-growing States. Their principal commerce consists in buying and selling human beings. These are their principal productions, their staple commodities, on which their prosperity depends. I think we are now prepared to adopt the doctrine of "non-intervention," so far as that commerce is concerned. Let those people be invested with the rights of "popular sovereignty;" and, while on board our ships upon the high seas, we will permit them to go voluntarily to the baracoons of the South, or to take possession of the slave-dealers and carry them to the slave marts of Africa. Let them enslave and sell their masters, or submit to be sold by them.

When the proposition comes up to repeal those laws of the United States which authorize, encourage, or sustain the slave trade and slavery in the District of Columbia, will the South interpose any objection? Will they repudiate the doctrine of "non-intervention?" Shall we withdraw the protection of Congress to freedom in Nebraska and Kansas, and continue protection to the slave trade and slavery in the District of Columbia? Has this motto of "non-intervention" a local application, suited to particular degrees of longitude? Shall we support oppression and the raising of human beings for market in this city, and withdraw our protection of liberty in Kansas and Nebraska?

Mr. Chairman, the people of the free States are aroused. They have shaken off the lethargy which has so long rested upon them. They are prepared to grapple with this question of slavery, and to wipe away the stain from the Federal Government. No magic wand will again pass over them, lulling them to quiet repose, while southern oppression shall wind its meshes about the limbs of the northern giant. Our Sampson will not be seduced to sleep on the lap of effeminate servility, while she shaves from him the locks in which his great strength lies. No sir; this Federal Government must be divorced from all support of the "peculiar institution." We will wash our hands

from the stains of oppression, purify ourselves from its iniquities, and free ourselves from its influence, our moral and political liberty, so far as we

The people of the new slave States. Should Kansas be admitted with a slaveholding constitution, she will not be admitted to this political copartnership. We will not receive her into our firm. Should she ask us to admit her with the advantages over us of having three votes for every five slaves; or, in other words, should she ask us to receive her into the Union, giving to the holder of five slaves the same influence and power in the Government which four of our intelligent lovers of liberty possess, we will discard and repudiate the dishonorable proposition. No, sir; if she enters this Union she must come with the same rights which we ourselves possess. We will not degrade ourselves by admitting her with superior advantages which would dishonor and degrade every freeman of the North. Our motto shall be non-intervention in favor of slavery; popular sovereignty for the North as well as the South; and we intend this popular sovereignty shall be exerted by the North and acknowledged by the South.

This, then, is our position. We have been driven to it by the Administration. We have been compelled to take it in order to our self-defense—to protect our own honor, our own rights. From my early manhood I have been connected with the Democratic party. It was my pride and my pleasure to act with them while they acted upon Democratic principles; but when, under the leadership of Mr. Pierce, they turned their efforts, and prostituted their influence to extend slavery, to increase its evils, to open up slave markets on soil which, for more than a generation, had been consecrated expressly to freedom, I could not, I would not go with them. They set at defiance the popular will, repudiated the doctrines of our fathers, who declared all men to be endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and instead of wielding the powers of Government to secure these rights, the present Administration have wielded those powers to remove that security which had been thrown around the people of Nebraska and Kansas by the Congress of 1820.

The people of the whole North, and of the South, also, if true to constitutional liberty, true to themselves, true to the progressive sentiments of the age in which we live, will hereafter see that the powers of this Federal Government shall be wielded for freedom—to promote the objects for which it was originally intended—the happiness and progress of mankind. We shall, if true to these objects, make no more compromises. We will carry out the Constitution, giving to all its parts such construction as will "promote union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to all the people" under our exclusive jurisdiction.





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 897 777 4

